

DRAFT

CPC Committee Meeting
3/10/15
Rockport Police Station
7pm

Members Present: R. George (Chair), P. Crotty (Co-Chair), M. Lash, M. Michaels, B. Brosnan, J. McMahon, B. Reed and S. DeMarco

Members not present: E. Hand

First up was the issue of Action's late application. Committee members introduced themselves to the Action panel, and R. George said the Committee was ready to listen to the reasons their application was late.

Action members introduced themselves to the Committee. They proceeded to explain that a long time employee who had always done the application had recently retired. Consequently, they assigned another employee to take on the task of getting the the application done. It was discovered late in the game the employee had forgotten to do the application. The panel said they were angry and embarrassed because they had always prided themselves on submitting their application on time. The employee was demoted as a result.

The panel made it clear they were aware of the importance of deadlines in grant writing. They emphasized they were not taking it lightly. They said they appreciated the opportunity to *even* address the Committee. They were concerned that the clients who depend on the housing program would be the ones to suffer. They added that the crippling snow storm had not helped in the matter.

A member of Action's board was there to guarantee “this would never happen again.”

The Committee wanted to know what would happen if Action did not get the funding. The panel said they would not be able to accept new clients, and they would have to “take a look” at their existing clients. It was possible that some clients would lose their housing.

M. Michaels stressed how difficult this decision was for the Committee. He explained that it can never happen again.

R. George acknowledged that Action runs an important program that has helped many needy Rockport residents. Her final statement was “this is not about Action but this is about the people who are going to lose their benefits.”

The Committee said they would discuss and vote on this at the end of the meeting.

Next on the agenda was Millbrook Meadows. They introduced themselves to the Committee.

Their panel went briefly through their application to restore the park, and explained some of the finer points of the project.

There was a lot of discussion because the application was so extensive.

M. Michaels gave the panel a list of questions that he had compiled. The Committee also had many questions of their own.

The Committee asked the panel if they were willing to remove some of the items because it was such an expensive project. The panel explained they would like to keep everything in but acknowledged that some *small* items might appeal to individual donors. They did say “they were open to negotiation.”

The Committee asked if cuts could be made so that the money wouldn't need to be bonded. The panel made it clear they were not willing to cut back that much. They felt they had already pared it down as much as they could. It was suggested that maybe some of the money could be bonded, and some could come from regular monies.

The Committee was concerned about giving the funds out all at once. The panel was adamant that the project would not work in two phases. According to the panel, it would be counterproductive, and they would rather not do it at all if that were the case. They also pointed out that it is much more cost effective to do the project at one time.

The Committee is hesitant to bond this project because the Community House project is already bonded.

Another of the Committee's many concerns was the panel was presenting the project too early. It has not been bid out yet, and what if it doesn't bid out at the \$1.29 million the panel is asking for?

The project is expected to be take one summer and fall.

M. Michaels said if this project was approved, it would take approximately 25% of CPC's budget.

M. Michaels asked the panel if they would be willing to take the list of questions with them. The panel was more than willing to do this. The said they will also e-mail a cost estimate.

The panel was asked to come back on 5/12/15 with answers to the questions provided by Mel, and further discussion.

M. Michaels volunteered to work with panel members to help with some of the questions.

Both committees congratulated each other for all their effort and hard work on the project.

M. Michaels suggested that future applicants be given at least two or three weeks notice before they are due to appear before the Committee. This gives them ample time to prepare.

Next on the agenda was the acceptance of the January and February minutes. Motion to approve, motion seconded, vote was an unanimous yes.

R. George will collect our new name plates at the end of each meeting. Thank you Ruth!

No update on signs.

R. George had a note from Mary Francis from UU about money that was appropriated last year. It is available to read.

R. George is going to meet with Ray Lamont to talk about CPC. She will bring him a list of projects the Committee has worked on. He wants to do a series of articles on CPC. Ruth said he was enthusiastic and very approachable.

R. George passed out the schedule for upcoming meetings.

There was some discussion about the Community House. It was pointed out that 1000 people a week go through that building

P. Crotty's motion from last month's meeting regarding Action was read. After much discussion about whether to accept Action's late application, a vote was taken. The result was six yeas, two opposed, and one abstained. Motion carried. R. George will inform them of the decision, and they were put on the agenda for May 12th to present their application.

Next meeting scheduled for 4/14/15.

P. Crotty made a motion to adjourn, and S. DeMarco seconded it.